

*United States Marine Corps
Command and Staff College
Marine Corps University
2076 South Street
Marine Corps Combat Development Command
Quantico, Virginia 22134-5068*

MASTER OF MILITARY STUDIES

***TITLE: FRENCH AND ENGLISH EQUALITY OF LANGUAGE STATUS IN
THE OFFICER CORPS OF THE CANADIAN INFANTRY***

**SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF MILITARY STUDIES**

**AUTHOR: MAJOR J.R.G. MELANCON, Royal 22^e Regiment,
CANADIAN FORCES**

AY 2000-01

**Mentor: Maj Ian Hunt, Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry, Canadian
Forces Liaison Officer USMC.**

Approved: _____

Date: _____

Mentor: Dr Donald F. Bittner, Professor of History

Approved: _____

Date: _____

Report Documentation Page		
Report Date 12 Apr 2001	Report Type N/A	Dates Covered (from... to) -
Title and Subtitle French and English Equality of Language Status in the Officer Corps of the Canadian Infantry	Contract Number	
	Grant Number	
	Program Element Number	
Author(s)	Project Number	
	Task Number	
	Work Unit Number	
Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es) Joint Military Operations Department Naval War College 686 Cushing Road Newport, RI 02841-1207	Performing Organization Report Number	
Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es)	Sponsor/Monitor's Acronym(s)	
	Sponsor/Monitor's Report Number(s)	
Distribution/Availability Statement Approved for public release, distribution unlimited		
Supplementary Notes The original document contains color images.		
Abstract <p>The research question is to ascertain if French and English have equality of status within the Canadian Infantry Officer Corps. If not, what could be done to achieve this goal? Based on surveys of the officers, the answer from both groups is no Anglophones, and Francophones replied in the negative at 77% and 79% respectively. Although the law states both languages have equality of status, in practice this is not the case. The surveys showed that 25% of the Anglophones versus 67% of the Francophones are eligible for promotion to the rank of Colonel and above. The equal representation of eligibility for promotion between both groups must be maintained. Therefore, urgent action must be taken to eliminate this problem. There is a sense of discrimination for 33% of the Anglophones versus only 14% of the Francophones. The key to success is leadership, implemented from the top down. The Official Language Act is in effect, but not enforced. If the leaders are not willing to fully implement it, this policy should be amended. Providing only lip service is a detriment to the moral of the officers and accomplishment of the stated official national goals of bilingualism.</p>		
Subject Terms		
Report Classification unclassified	Classification of this page unclassified	

Classification of Abstract unclassified	Limitation of Abstract UU
Number of Pages 74	

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		FORM APPROVED - - - OMB NO. 0704-0188	
<small>public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters services, directorate for information operations and reports, 1215 Jefferson davis highway, suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the office of management and budget, paperwork reduction project (0704-0188) Washington, dc 20503</small>			
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (LEAVE BLANK)	2. REPORT DATE 12 APR 2001	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED STUDENT RESEARCH PAPER	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE FRENCH AND ENGLISH EQUALITY OF LANGUAGE STATUS IN THE OFFICER CORPS OF THE CANADIAN INFANTRY?		5. FUNDING NUMBERS N/A	
6. AUTHOR(S) MAJOR RENE MELANCON, CANADIAN FORCES			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) USMC COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE 2076 SOUTH STREET, MCCDC, QUANTICO, VA 22134-5068		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NONE	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) SAME AS #7.		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER: NONE	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES NONE			
12A. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT NO RESTRICTIONS		12B. DISTRIBUTION CODE N/A	
13. ABSTRACT (MAXIMUM 200 WORDS) <p>The research question is to ascertain if French and English have equality of status within the Canadian Infantry Officer Corps. If not, what could be done to achieve this goal? Based on surveys of the officers, the answer from both groups is “no” Anglophones, and Francophones replied in the negative at 77% and 79% respectively. Although the law states both languages have equality of status, in practice this is not the case.</p> <p>The surveys showed that 25% of the Anglophones versus 67% of the Francophones are eligible for promotion to the rank of Colonel and above. The equal representation of eligibility for promotion between both groups must be maintained. Therefore, urgent action must be taken to eliminate this problem. There is a sense of discrimination for 33% of the Anglophones versus only 14% of the Francophones.</p> <p>The key to success is leadership, implemented from the top down. The Official Language Act is in effect, but not enforced. If the leaders are not willing to fully implement it, this policy should be amended. Providing only lip service is a detriment to the moral of the officers and accomplishment of the stated official national goals of bilingualism.</p>			
14. SUBJECT TERMS (KEY WORDS ON WHICH TO PERFORM SEARCH) Bilinguism, Official Languages Act, Official Language, Anglophones, Francophones, Canadian Infantry Officer Corps, Canada.		15. NUMBER OF PAGES: 62	
		16. PRICE CODE: N/A	

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE:	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT
UNCLASSIFIED	UNCLASSIFIED	UNCLASSIFIED	

DISCLAIMER

THE OPINIONS AND CONCLUSIONS EXPRESSED HEREIN ARE THOSE OF THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT AUTHOR AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT THE VIEWS OF EITHER THE MARINE CORPS COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE, THE CANADIAN DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE, OR ANY OTHER US OR CANADIAN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES. REFERENCES TO THIS STUDY SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOREGOING STATEMENT.

ABSTRACT

TITLE: French and English Equality of Status in the Canadian Infantry Officer Corps

STUDENT: Maj J.R.G. Melancon, Royal 22^e Regiment, Canadian Armed Forces

CLASS NO: AY 2000-2001

DATE: December 2000

COMMITTEE: Dr Donald F Bittner, Professor of History
Maj Ian Hunt, PPCLI

The research question is to ascertain if French and English have equality of status within the Canadian Infantry Officer Corps. If not, what could be done to achieve this goal? Based on surveys of the officers, the answer from both groups is “no” Anglophones, and Francophones replied in the negative at 77% and 79% respectively. Although the law states both languages have equality of status, in practice this is not the case.

The surveys also showed that 25% of the Anglophones versus 67% of the Francophones are eligible for promotion to the rank of Colonel and above. The equal representation of eligibility for promotion between both groups must be maintained. Therefore, urgent action must be taken to eliminate this problem.

Anglophones have attended on average more language courses than the Francophones (two versus 1.1 course on average). However, time and location were concerns. The surveys also revealed the following views: Language courses given prior to the military occupation classification (MOC) training were not a motivator, should be longer in length than six months, placed in an immersion environment, and students dissociated from their primary duties to get a firm grasp of the second language.

Following the course the officers should be sent to work in their second language in an immersion situation, in bilingual unit (BU), French language unit (FLU), or English language unit (ELU). Significantly, 33% of the Anglophones never worked in their

second language, while all the Francophones did. Thus, Anglophones encounter problems in maintaining their newly acquired language skills without the opportunity of a post-course posting to a second language unit (FLU or BU).

There is a sense of discrimination for 33% of the Anglophones versus only 14% of the Francophones. The latter has no choice but to struggle with the English language early in their careers to succeed. Once the Francophone reaches the integral level, it is no longer an issue. The Anglophones struggle to master the French language is a much longer journey, requiring a constant effort to maintain and especially when not given the immersion opportunity.

Proposed solutions from both groups address immersion. Since it is mathematically impossible to have all the Anglophones in immersion, small compounding solutions should be implemented. Foremost would be to ensure the FLU, ELU, and BU quotas, are staffed fully in the infantry battalions with exchange officers from the other regiments. Others would be to maximize sub sub-unit exchange between the regiments. Finally, the policy for language requirement should be enforced fully. The use of “Acting lacking” rank could possibly damage the unity in the CF in the long term, it is the horns of the dilemma, as it is perceived differently from the Anglophones and the Francophones. Other proposed solutions specific for each group are related to promotion. Some Anglophones suggest that language should not be a requirement for promotion, or should be lowered for promotion to a level “train to need” since they do not have the same immersion opportunities as the Francophones.

Francophones are firmer on the promotion criteria. They believe it should be applied to the letter of the law. An option could be to conduct all the educational and

training courses in alternating languages. Both groups would have to struggle equally initially, but an immersion atmosphere would be generated. The BU should also have a percentage of French activities. Equally important, the automatic deferent to English in BU must stop.

The key to success is leadership, implemented from the top down. The Official Language Act is in effect, but not enforced. If the leaders are not willing to fully implement it, this policy should be amended. Providing only lip service is a detriment to the moral of the officers and accomplishment of the stated official national goals of bilingualism.

Table of Contents

	Pages
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
PREFACE	ii
CHAPTER 1: Historical background	1
CHAPTER 2: Policies and goals of the Canadian Forces	7
CHAPTER 3: The survey, equality of status between English and French, in the Officer Corps of the Infantry, in 2000	
Section 1: Analyzing questions 1, 2	11
Section 2: Analyzing questions 3, 4	24
Section 3: Analyzing questions 5, 6, 7	33
CONCLUSION	43
APPENDIX A: Covering letter and survey sample (English)	47
APPENDIX B: Covering letter and survey sample (French)	51
APPENDIX C: Definition of terms	55
APPENDIX D: Acronyms	58
BIBLIOGRAPHY	60

Preface

As a French Canadian member of the Canadian forces (CF) for the past 18 years, bilingualism has been a daily concern for me. I have been fortunate enough to serve in both French and English environments. Bilingualism has been of interest all these years, since I was not bilingual upon enrollment into the Canadian Forces (CF). In my experience, it has always been **nearly impossible to switch** anywhere at any time from one language to another in our daily operations. Even bilingual Units (BU), most of the time we reverted to speaking English to accommodate one or more members who could unfortunately not speak enough French to follow conversations and orders. During my years at the Royal Military College, Kingston, there were alternating English and French weeks. Although these periods were supposed to alternate between both languages, they usually ended up alternating between English and English/French weeks. This requirement of alternating language weeks was and is following the spirit of the Official Languages Act (1969, as amended in 1988), which states that in Canada both languages are official and enjoy an equality of status.

I am fortunate enough to have been able to join a French Canadian regiment, the Royal 22^e Regiment, where I could speak and work in my mother tongue on a regular basis. I have noticed substantial improvement in bilingualism in my time in the CF. This has not been achieved, however without controversy. In 1997, the introduction of the Officer Professional Development (OPD) System identifying and requiring certain levels of bilingualism prior to promotions to superior officers brought controversy and debate over the issue within the ranks of the CF.

The **Proposed research question** is as follows: English and French are the two official languages in Canada. According to the Official Language Act and government policy, French and English have equality of status in the Canadian Armed Forces. Has the infantry officer corps reached this status? If not, what could be done to achieve this goal?

To develop a framework, this paper will provide a **brief overview of the historical context** to the situation, as well as discuss the improvements that have been made towards addressing the issue of bilingualism and language equality in the CF over the years. This issue is more than simply language; there are also cultural differences between each ethnic grouping whose primary language is English or French. This paper will provide the **policies and goals the CF** has set in official orders to reach an equality of language status in its ranks and services. In order to deal with this issue in a reasonable way within the time constraints, my research will be limited to the officer corps of the Canadian Infantry. I elicited responses from infantry officers from across Canada. By using a survey oriented toward this specific goal, a **clearer picture of the status of bilinguism** in the year 2000 of the infantry officer corps was achieved. The regular officers of the three infantry regiments are on the order of battle were surveyed. Two are anglophones: The Royal Canadian Regiment (RCR), the Princess Patricia Light Infantry (PPCLI), and one francophone: The Royal 22^e Regiment (R22^eR). Quotations from the surveys are listed in alpha numeric, “E” for English, and “F” for French respondent followed by the number assigned in the order in which they were returned to me for compilation. Anonymity of the respondents, crucial for adequate research, was

promised and respected throughout the text. The original responses are retained by the author.

My goal in initiating this research was to ascertain the English and French current pulse of the Infantry Officer Corp. From this, I was able to postulate where the CF are headed linguistically in the future. I intend to use the results of the surveys to identify problem areas and suggest some improvement, if warranted. Perceived changes, if appropriate, are recommended. This could reduce the friction that currently exists within the CF and move the language policy toward Canada's common goal: to work in an equal language status. It is very important to note that I am limiting this study to the day to day operations of infantry corps officers within Canada only. International operations are not addressed in this paper. The language issue of other corps and services are not addressed. These are important, but are left to further research and assessment by others.

In my research, I sent surveys to the three infantry regiments in Canada (Royal Canadian Regiment [RCR],¹ Princess Patricia Canadian Light Infantry [PPCLI],² and Royal 22^e Regiment [R22^eR]),³ to the CF Infantry School, the Area Command Headquarters, and the National Defense Headquarters in Ottawa. This cross section query provided a balanced response from the English and the French perspectives in the different regiments and commands throughout Canada. The infantry school is represented by both Francophone and Anglophone infantry officers from the three infantry regiments in Canada. Although CF Colonels and above do not have an affiliation with a regiment, they have been included in the survey. Their broader

¹ RCR are located in London and Gagetown

² PPCLI are located in Edmonton and Winnipeg

³ R22^eR are located in Quebec city

experience provided the survey with a deeper perspective given their time and background within the CF.

In my desire to present a balanced view to the issue, I have been very fortunate to have the support of an Anglophone infantry officer as a mentor for my project, Major Ian Hunt (PPCLI), who provided me with guidance and assistance. As early as July 2000, Dr Donald Bittner displayed a great interest in the subject, his dedication, and his support was invaluable. My project would not have been possible without the outstanding support received from Elizabeth Allard in Director of Land Personal Office (DLP 6). Her passion for the integration of the two official languages into the Canadian Forces sets quite an example in the Canadian Forces. Finally, I would like to thank all the officers, who took the time to complete my survey. In particular I would like to acknowledge Major Alain Belzile (in Gagetown), Major Louis Painchaud (in Quebec), Capt Serge Thibodeau (in Ottawa), and Capt Doris Gobeil (in Ottawa) who greatly helped me with the survey distribution and collection in Canada.

Chapter 1: Historical background

In order to provide a clear understanding on the current situation of the use of the English and French languages in the Canadian military, the history must be understood. The distinction between French and English has its roots in the British conquest of 1759 during the French and Indian War, in which General James Wolfe triumphed over the Marquis de Montcalm on the Abraham plains outside Quebec city.¹ Following the Seven Years War, France ceded Canada to Britain in Treaty of Paris (1763).² Major General James Murray became the first British governor of Quebec. In order to suppress Pontiac's Rebellion he formed again a French Canadian militia. They had been raised prior to the Seven years war, some had served under Montcalm, and many were considered as the bravest soldiers from a distinct French society.³ On the other hand, Murray received secret instructions from London which ordered the Anglicization of the French Canadians (French speaking and Roman Catholic) as soon as possible.⁴

The implementation of these instructions initiated the French Canadian's Fear of an "English" Canada. Although provincial militia corps units were formed in Quebec and other parts of Canada, Quebec was the only province that had French speaking one.⁵ It is important to note that in Canada's Confederation of 1867, Article 133 provided for the equality of status of both languages. However, there is nothing instituting or guaranteeing equality of status of French or English language in the militia law adopted the 22 May 1868. Following Confederation, permanent units were created

¹ Trevor N. Dupuy, Curt Johnson, and David L. Bonguard, Harper Encyclopedia of Military Biography, Castle Book 1992, Wolfe James, and Montcalm Louis-Joseph de Montcalm-Gozon.

² World History 1650 to the present Notes, (Coles publishing company limited, 1981), p 7.

³ Jean Pariseau et Serge Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais et le Bilinguisme dans les Forces Armees Canadiennes, (Service Historique de la Defense Nationale, Tome 1 1763-1969,1987), p 30.

to replace the British troops; three of those ten units were in Quebec yet they were commanded in English.⁶ During the Louis Riel rebellion in Canada's West in 1885, the French Canadian militia was not included in the expedition as the government correctly deemed it unwise to bring Francophone military forces against Francophone Metis.⁷

French Canadians took part in the 19th century wars of the British Empire, such as the Zulu war and the Boer war, albeit in small numbers. On the eve of World War I, only 9.1% of officers in the permanent forces were Francophone even though the French Canadians represented 28.5% of Canada's population.⁸ Nor was there was a clear and defined equality between the French and the English Language in the permanent force. Actually, all training was done in English which explains, in part, the predominance of Anglophones in the permanent force.

World War I produced the first French Canadian unit, the 22^e French Canadian battalion.⁹ This was the only command where French Canadians could serve and speak in French. On 1 April 1920, the present "Royal 22^e Regiment", became the first permanent formation entirely composed of French Canadians.¹⁰ All business was conducted in English outside the unit, but for the first time an official regular French speaking unit existed as an operational formation. This was an important step forward to creating a bilingual environment. However, still no place existed in the Royal Canadian Navy or the Royal Canadian Air Force for the French speaking citizen unless he could

⁴ Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais, Tome 1, p 34.

⁵ Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais, Tome 1, p 35.

⁶ Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais, Tome 1, pp 50-52.

⁷ Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais Tome 1, p 60.

⁸ Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais, Tome 1, p 70.

⁹ Regie du Royal 22e Regiment, Histoire du Royal 22e Regiment, (Edition du Pellican, 1964), p 17.

¹⁰ Regie du Royal 22e Regiment, p 39.

speak and understand English. French Canadians in the Navy and Air Force felt that they were being treated as second class citizens.¹¹

The Interwar years were characterized by little improvement, although in theory the lessons learned in the First World War could have provided for such. On the eve of World War II, the infantry was still the only refuge for the French speaking Canadians who wished to serve in Canada's military. The R22^eR represented 19% of the overall infantry strength, but only 4.4% of the overall permanent force. As for the militia units, although existed 123 units in 1933, by 1939 only 14 of them were francophone.¹²

The Second World War increased the number of the French Canadians serving overseas. As the units in the combat arms were grouped by their geographical area, French Canadians coming from the province of Quebec could serve in a unit with their fellow Quebecois. In 1940, 5^e Brigade was intended to be a French Canadian unit, but with the dispatching of its regiments to other divisions this never happened. By the end of the war, 8.1% of the general and superior officers were French Canadian. However, the French Canadian officers had to learn, speak, and understand, English in order to serve their country. The end of Second World War only renewed the political differences between French and English speaking Canadian soldiers. Since French Canadians could only serve their country in their mother tongue (French) in one of the four French speaking infantry units (R22^eR, Fusiliers du Mont-Royal, Regiment de Maisonneuve, and Regiment de la Chaudiere), again they felt treated as second class citizens¹³

After the war, the language issue reappeared as a political issue in the CF. Thus for Francophone officers, in 1952 the "College Militaire Royal de St-Jean" (CMR) was

¹¹ Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais, Tome 1, p 108.

¹² Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais, Tome 1, pp 100-104.

created. However, the program was five years, with the final two in order to graduate were given only at the Royal Military College (RMC) Kingston. It was also harder for the Francophones to graduate because classes at RMC were conducted in English. In 1966 General Jean Victor Allard, who at the time was the Chief of Defense, the first French Canadian to occupy this position, initiated studies to understand and document the French Canadian condition within the Canadian Forces (CF). At this time, 10% of Canadians serving in CF were French Canadian whereas 30% of the population of Canada was ethnic French.¹⁴ His desire to give French Canadians the opportunity to work in French gave birth to the 5^e GBMC- “5^e Groupe Brigade Mecanise du Canada” or the French Canadian Brigade. It was one of four such brigades in the country (the other were Anglophones) and therefore represented a form of proportional representation in the CF.

A political effort during this period was made to reduce the inequality between French and English Canadians in the military. Also, as part of this initiative, an effort was made to have Francophones represented in the CF in proportion to the Canadian population, while also giving them equal career opportunities. In April 1968 the French Language Unit (FLU) was introduced.¹⁵ The intent was to provide a predominantly French work environment for the French Canadian. This was done with a view to avoid segregation by allowing up to 20 % of FLU’s members to be Anglophone. The same was done for ELU (English language unit), which also had an allowance of up to 20 % Francophone membership in it. Also the Official Languages Act (Bill C120) was

¹³ Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais, Tome 1, pp 114-133.

¹⁴ Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais, Tome 1, p218.

¹⁵ Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais, Tome 1, p230.

adopted on 7 July 1969.¹⁶ The Act stated that French and English have equality of status, as both official languages in Canada. Equal opportunity was to be provided for both groups in the governmental institutions, while the public could be served and work in the language of individual choice. The next major challenge for the CF was an institutional change to implement Bill C120. The mathematical impossibility of having 20 % Francophone or Anglophone representation in each unit was later reduced to 10 %. A basic problem had developed in that there was three Anglophones for every Francophone, so if all the Francophones are sent to an ELU to meet the 20%, there would not be enough Francophones to man the FLU.

The solution of the Defense Department was the adoption of a bilingualism program on 17 December 1969.¹⁷ The year 1972 saw the introduction of a 15-year plan to address the situation, to be implemented in three five-year blocks. It was to culminate in 1987. This ambitious scheme contained a myriad of policies to be introduced, including working environment, recruitment, promotion, family support, and translation of all documents into both official languages.¹⁸ Each military position in the establishment had to be denoted as unilingual French, unilingual English, or bilingual. The intent was to attain 28% French Canadian membership in the CF, an equal representation in the work place as to the French Canadian proportion of the Canadian population. Its application was decentralized to the command level. This initiative was a major reorganization challenge for the whole of the CF.

¹⁶ Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais, Tome 1, p248.

¹⁷ Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais et le Bilinguisme dans les Forces Armees Canadiennes, (Service Historique de la Defense Nationale, Tome 2 1769-1987,1987), p11.

¹⁸ Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais, Tome 2, p37.

However, in 1987 a special report by the Director of Official Languages (DOL), Monsieur D'Iberville Fortier, stated the objectives had not been met. The Defense Minister, Perrin Beatty, accepted the report in the "letter and the spirit" in which it had been written and stated that a renewal of the Official Languages Act implementation plan would be done.¹⁹ In direct response, the Official Languages Act was then revised in 1988 to enhance the obligations ensuring equality of language status.

Despite the problems and the shortfalls, there have been significant improvements since the original effort primarily initiated by General Jean Victor Allard in 1966. There has been a continuous effort toward the objective of institutional bilingualism in the CF. In April 1994, the representation of French Canadian officers in the Army was 28.6 %. However, representation of senior officers was only 19 % for Lieutenant Colonel, 16% for Colonel, 26% for Brigadier General, 28% for Major General, 20% for Lieutenant General. An important point to note is the Army had the highest representation compared with the other two elements of the CF (Air Force 24.6% and Navy 17.6%).²⁰ At the officers' level, the representation was 24 % of the CF but there was still an overall under representation at the senior officers' level (Lieutenant Colonel and Colonel).²¹ In 1997, the National Representation Group ratio for planning purposes, for the population of Canada, was estimated to be 74% Anglophone and 26 % Francophone.²²

¹⁹ Pariseau et Bernier, Les Canadiens Francais, Tome 2, pp53-54

²⁰ Elizabeth Allard, Notes de Synthese pour le SMA (pers) Enjeux et Sconva, 18 April 1994.

²¹ Elizabeth Allard, Expose du MGen Boyle sur la Participation des Francophones dans les FC, June 1995.

²² A-AD-102-001/AG-001, Official Languages in DND and the CF, 1997-11-25, p 3.

Chapter 2: Policies and goals of the Canadian Forces

In the previous chapter the progression of the institutional bilingualism in the CF was explained. In order to understand the structure of the institution operating in two languages, it is necessary to address the laws and some issues that are integrated in to the day to day operation of its units. The Official Language program in the CF directly reflects the 1988 **revision** of the Official Languages Act. This revision occurred since the original 15-year plan did not achieve all of its objectives.

English and French are the official languages of Canada. The Official Languages Act commits the CF to the following: languages have equality of status, service can be received in the language of each member's choice, and all CF members can have a career in the language of their choice. The policy further states, that there must be equal opportunities to work in his/her language of choice, and the CF must strive to enhance the representation of minority groups in the community.²³ In order to make this statement valid, there is a designation of units which are English Language Units (ELU), French Language Units (FLU), Bilingual Units (BU), and Unspecified Languages Units (ULU). The designation of the unit will identify in which language work will be primarily done.

The concept for the different units is to provide an opportunity for either linguistic group to serve in their language of choice.²⁴ The ELU or FLU **can have** up to 20% of their strength represented by the other linguistic group. This provides an opportunity to work with the other linguistic group, in theory providing for better understanding of each other's culture. The BU is represented in accordance with the National Representation

²³ A-AD-102-001/AG-001, Official Languages in DND and the CF, 1997-11-25, p 2.

Group where positions are identified as French, English, or bilingual. The Unspecified Language Units (ULU) are for outside agencies such as NATO or NORAD.

The general rule is that CF personnel will communicate orally and in writing in the language designation of his/her position. **The responsibility for understanding the communication for the CF personnel is normally placed on the recipient.**²⁵ This system, therefore, provides equal opportunities for each linguistic group. The original intention remains: “the infrastructure must allow for the employment of unilingual English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians.”²⁶

To support these units, the production of text in both languages depends upon the designation of the unit. When required by the unit’s language designation, (French, English, or bilingual), translated documents are to be issued simultaneously in both official languages. There is, however, an exception for some services that have to be produced in both official languages regardless of the unit’s language designation. These exceptions are for the provision of basic services and the services provided to the military families.²⁷

To provide equal opportunity to each officer to enhance his/her linguistic level, there is an Officer Professional Development (OPD) System. Its goal is succinctly stated: “The objective of the OPD system is to ensure the officer corps is able to provide effective leadership and management of the CF. All officers shall meet minimum established standards for the promotion, selection, and employment”.²⁸ The OPD is

²⁴ It is not just language skill but also the different cultures associated with the two major ethnic groups in Canada which also must be comprehended.

²⁵ A-AD-102-001/AG-001, Official Languages in DND and the CF, 1997-11-25, p 9.

²⁶ A-AD-102-001/AG-001, Official Languages in DND and the CF, 1997-11-25, p 2.

²⁷ A-AD-102-001/AG-001, Official Languages in DND and the CF, 1997-11-25, p 9.

²⁸ DAOD 5038-1, Officer Professional Development (OPD) System, 26 November 1997, URL: http://131.134.220.99/admfincs/subjects/DAOD/5038/1_e.asp. Accessed 31 May 2000.

based on four pillars: education, self-development, experience, and training.²⁹ The **bilingual requirement is only one part** of the program. In order to be promoted to a higher rank, each officer must meet the mandatory requirements and **bilinguism is one part of the promotion requirements**. There is, in theory, a level of language proficiency for officers coming into a zone for promotion to a higher rank. One source of debate is that there is an exemption authority for the bilingual requirement in the CF where officers can be promoted “acting lacking.” These officers are promoted without the appropriate language proficiency and are given a time period of three years to reach the required proficiency level.

The system thus allows an officer to continue in his/her career being unilingual; there are still officers that are unilingual. However, with the introduction of the OPD, an officer who does not meet the language prerequisite for the next rank will not progress to superior officer’s rank since he/she will not be able to compete with others who do. The proficiency language level provides additional points for the promotion board. The competition is so tight for the rank of Captain and above, those additional points are essential to be promoted.

As this historical overview demonstrates, this problem has long been present Canadian society and the CF of which they are part. However, there is a recent parallel development towards equal representation of the two-language groups within the CF. Major changes were supposed to start in 1966, but there is still much to be done if official

²⁹ There are schools located on most Canadian military bases providing the language courses for its members. These offered three-month, six-month, yearlong, and refresher courses. The majority of the schools are located in the English Canada and the majority of students are English. Therefore for Anglophones it is harder to achieve immersion for its members.

goals are to be met. This basic overview of the language policy provides the tools to comprehend the actual analysis of the surveys received.

Chapter 3: The survey, equality of language status between English and French, in the Officer Corps of the Infantry, in 2000.

Section 1: Analyzing questions 1 & 2

Question 1: On enrollment were you unilingual or bilingual? If the latter where did you receive your language instruction?

Question 2: Have you had official second language training? If so how for long, where and when? What were the strengths and/or weaknesses of this program?

The first two chapters have provided an understanding of the overall situation and an awareness of the Canadian laws and goals governing the language policies of the CF. The next is to analyze the survey that was collected from the Officer Corps of the Infantry to ascertain the situation as of 2000. The following analysis is based on 113 surveys, which were returned: 48 Anglophone and 65 Francophone. The analysis will be done in a comparative manner to see if the CF have reached the goal of French and English equality of status in the Officer Corps of the Infantry as **perceived** by those officers.

At this point there is some terminology that must be defined to fully understand the analysis. An **Anglophone** is a person whose first official language is English, and similarly a **Francophone** is one whose first official language is French.³⁰ Furthermore, the terms integral and functional are related to the individual's proficiency level in the second language. The qualifications of **integral** or **functional** are **determined** from the

³⁰ DAOD 5039-0, Official Languages, 30 January 1998, URL: http://131.134.220.99/admfincs/subjects/DAOD/5039/1_e.asp. Accessed 31 May 2000, p1.

language exam results.³¹ Each officer early in his/her career has to do the language test, this will assesses their skill level in their second language. The test results will identify the officers has being integral, functional, or unilingual. In simple terms **integral** means that the individual is completely bilingual, and **functional** means he/she can adequately function in his/her second language. Unilingual is self-explanatory, i.e., skill in only one language.

TABLE 1: SUVEY RESPONDENTS BY LANGUAGE AND RANK LEVEL.

Rank	English	French	Total
Brigadier General	1	0	1
Colonel	5	0	5
Lieutenant Colonel	5	6	11
Major	12	24	36
Captain	20	25	45
Lieutenant	2	6	8
Second Lieutenant	3	4	7
<u>Total</u>	48	65	113

Table 1 shows that more Francophones responded than Anglophones, although there are two English speaking regiments and only one French. The majority of the respondents are in the rank of Captain and Major, again more Francophones than Anglophones. They have from 10 to 20 years of experience in the CF. The senior

³¹ OAF 9-21, Enseignement des Langues, Connaissances Linguistiques et Administrations de Tests dans les Forces Canadiennes-Langues Officielles, 13 May 1998, URL: http://131.134.220.99/admfincs/subjects/cfao/009-21_f.asp. Accessed 11 May 2000, p7.

officers provided comments from a more experienced basis, but there were more Anglophone than Francophones. The Second Lieutenant, Lieutenant comments are fresh, providing a younger prospective partly rooted changes in the institutions, e.g. they only went to one military college (RMC in Kingston) since the other two have been closed. Their view is therefore different from the older officers, many of whom attended to one of the three existing military colleges or did not attend a military college.

From the database generated through the survey, the first major difference between the Anglophones and Francophones in their second language ability on enrollment in the CF. Of the respondents, **88% of the Anglophones are unilingual**, 2% are functional, and 10 % are integral. This clearly indicates that the great majority of English speaking officers at the beginning of their careers have very limited or no knowledge of the other official language. In contrast, **47 % of the Francophones are unilingual**, 27 % are functional, and 26 % are integral. Therefore, half of the Francophones joining are either functional or bilingual. The learning curve is therefore easier for the French Canadian. The environment in which the Francophones are living next to Anglophones, or simply living in Anglophone regions, could explain this variance.

At the very beginning of a new officer's career, there is already a difference in the language profile between the two groups. Once basic training has started, language training is integrated into the program as well. Of the 113 respondents, the schools they attended for their language training are located in the following cities: Victoria (British Columbia), Calgary (Alberta), Winnipeg (Manitoba), Kingston (Ontario), Ottawa (Ontario), Borden (Ontario), St Jean (Quebec), Valcartier (Quebec), and Gagetown (New

Brunswick). It is important to note that out of these locations, only two of them are in a French environment: St-Jean and Valcartier.

To compare language courses attendance between Anglophones and Francophones, a look at the number of courses taken by officers from their basic training and through their career would be appropriate. To ensure that the data is not inflated, those officers functioning at the integral language designation must be removed from the data set, as they have no need for further training and hence they are exempt.³² The data shows that on average the unilingual Anglophone will receive two courses compared to the Francophone who will receive 1.1 courses throughout their careers. These figures **exclude** language training that officers going to military college had during the academic year. The language courses at military college are not as intense, being only up to 45 minutes a day.

The continuous courses vary in their length, but the majority of the second language training courses attended by the officers in this survey were three months in length. The intensive courses were taken by 26 Anglophones as compared to 21 Francophones. There is also a yearlong course offered that was attended by 12 Anglophones as compared to three Francophones. The half-year course was attended by only six Anglophones and five Francophones. It is fair to say that for the officers requiring varying degrees of language training the opportunity is available. How effective this education is, however, another question.

From the analysis of the comments from the respondents, one major factor arises in the success of their learning the second language. It is the importance of the

³² The survey responses indicated that five Anglophones and 24 Francophones have never had to take courses. This is due to their high language proficiency levels upon at enrolment into the CF.

environment in which the course is being given. The respondents emphasize the **importance of immersion** in providing a more successful learning experience in their second language. Immersion is attained when the officer is learning his/her second language in a geographic cultural and societal location of his/her second language. Immersion provides and forces them to practice after the formal classes in their second language environment.

Comments from the Anglophones emphasized the great value of the immersion experience, which enhanced the course work provided in St Jean, or during their time in the “College Military Royal de St-Jean.”³³ It was stated “CMR training was well worth the effort...the French environment certainly helped develop our language skills.”³⁴ “That program was effective, most likely due to the complete immersion in a bilingual environment.”³⁵ “The main strength was that I was in a French environment outside the classes.”³⁶ “ St Jean was an excellent program as in most cases you had to use your second language if you went anywhere in town or did anything outside the base.”³⁷ “The problem with the program was trying to teach French in Calgary (no environment).”³⁸ These are only a few of many quotes to demonstrate the point made about the importance of the French environment from Anglophones to their learning.

Francophones made similar statements in their surveys. For them, St Jean was not a good place to learn the English language, as it was a French-speaking environment. However, some also stated that the Royal Military College in Kingston or the Royal

³³ One point important to note is that there is only one RMC located in Kingston (Ontario). There use to be three, CMR in St-Jean (Quebec), and RRMC in Victoria (British Columbia) are now closed.

³⁴ E for English respondent, 17 number assigned to the survey. E-17

³⁵ E-27

³⁶ E-30

³⁷ E-36

Roads Military College in Victoria were great learning places mainly due to the English-speaking environment **outside** the classroom and off base. Such comments submitted, “there is not enough individual French isolation in an Anglophone environment within a French group.”³⁹ Others like, “Gagetown’s strong point is the immersion environment.”⁴⁰ In Quebec, “The course was given in a French environment where it should have been given in the opposite.”⁴¹ “Kingston, very good course especially when you are immersed in the English environment.”⁴²

These were only a few of the comments made with regards to the importance of the environment to the success for gaining proficiency in the second language. It unfortunately becomes obvious that there are many cases where officers are being sent to learn a **second language in their own language environment. This is very detrimental to the learning process, as it does not maximize the language learning experience.**

The Anglophone participants have less chance than the Francophones to have this immersion, due to their location and that of the institutions offering courses. As stated earlier, there are only two French speaking locations. The CMR was a great opportunity for the Anglophones to get three to five years of complete immersion while studying for a bachelor degree. Now, with only one major military college left (RMC in Kingston), only the Francophones have access to immersion in a military college, located in an English society and cultural environment.

Since the issue of immersion is common to both Anglophones and Francophones seeking to improve their language skills, **a recommendation to reorient the course**

³⁸ E-33

³⁹ F for French respondent, 6 number assigned to the survey. F-6

⁴⁰ F-18

⁴¹ F-21

locations is in order. It would ensure that the CF sends Anglophones and Francophones into an immersion situation. Ironically, the CF is still sending students from both language groups to learn the other language in their own environment (e.g. Francophone learning English in Quebec). The solution is simple. The Anglophones must be sent to a French environment to learn the language and vice versa. The immersion environment not only provides a great opportunity to learn the second language but also the opportunity to be immersed in a different cultural, and the societal environment. This could be easily rectified by **reallocation of the resources** required to hold language **programs in immersion environments** and by proper administration of the requests for language training.

The quality of the instruction was also noted in the surveys. In general, a comment common to both groups was the quality of the instructions and instructors: “excellent teachers.”⁴³ A good balance in the material presented was also noted, “a strength was the focus on oral interaction, common expressions, and vocabulary for both military and civilian environment.”⁴⁴ There was also the odd comment about teachers who were changed too frequently or who were not interested in teaching, but the overall instruction comments were very positive.

Another point common to both groups, although more prevalent in the Anglophone responses, addressed the length of the courses: The **three and six month courses** were **not long enough**. The shorter courses did not allow beginners to progress far enough, to properly function in the second language. “Only completing 10 weeks is

⁴² F-33

⁴³ F-58

⁴⁴ E-40

not long enough to get far enough to be tested for profile.”⁴⁵ “The course was good but three months is really not enough to improve your profile.”⁴⁶ The “duty day” was also addressed, i.e., the courses should be **full days** instead of half days in order to be more effective. Also, having to catch up with one’s normal work after classes was difficult. “Half days ...to be very inefficient and more difficult to focus than a concentrated course,”⁴⁷ and that “part time basis while at CFB Borden...good, however not total immersion and you were expected to do your full time job.”⁴⁸ The point is that there is an interest but **not enough time is being set aside** for adequate learning in the second language. The **primary duty when in language courses should be to learn the language, to be performed while attending the one’s primary responsibilities.**

Once the course is completed there have to be possibilities for the officer to practice and improve their new skills. This was a very critical factor to success raised by the Anglophone respondents. Several Anglophone statements were, “if you do not work in your second language you will lose it. Training for the sake of PER (evaluation reports) points is a costly and useless endeavor.”⁴⁹ “No opportunity to use it.”⁵⁰ “No guarantee that the graduate would receive bilingual position.”⁵¹ “Good program, only problem is follow up, getting a job where one could really be using the second language.”⁵² The above were only a few of Anglophone comments, which imply to the **need to get employment in the second language following course completion.**

⁴⁵ E-21

⁴⁶ F-60

⁴⁷ E-15

⁴⁸ E-43

⁴⁹ E-12

⁵⁰ E-17

⁵¹ E-37

⁵² E-46

Significantly, none of the Francophones raised this as an issue, therefore suggesting that they have enough opportunities to practice in their work environments.

The recurrence of the need for a **follow up posting** in a bilingual environment suggests that there is a lack in the continuous integration in the second language. Since the knowledge of both official languages is vital for the career progression, greater **emphasis should be placed on proper utilization**. This is confirmed by an Anglophone officer serving in FLU saying that it is hard to learn oral French in an English environment, however learning in the FLU is highly effective due to the total immersion environment.⁵³ However, few were sent to the FLU and therefore the second language training is being wasted.⁵⁴ The opposite is true for Francophones serving in an ELU.

By policy, a FLU or ELU could have up to 20% serving in its ranks from the other linguistic group. The hard reality is that out of three infantry battalions forming the R22^eR (FLU), there is only one exchange officer from the other two regiments (ELU). Therefore, a **greater effort** could be made toward providing **better opportunities** for officers to serve in the other regiments through **cross-regimental postings**. There is only one other unit since the disbandment of the Airborne Regiment⁵⁵ which provides this kind of interaction between English and French infantry officers: the Infantry School at Gagetown, New Brunswick. Unfortunately most of the operations of the Infantry School are done in English. Thus, even the Infantry School linguistic opportunities for the Anglophones are reduced in effectiveness.

⁵³ E-25

⁵⁴ E-38

⁵⁵ The Canadian Airborne Regiment was composed of three commandos, one from each regiment. The combat support commando and the headquarters were a mixed of the three regiments. It was a unique immersion opportunity for all. It was disbanded following incidents in Somalia.

The advantages for the Francophones are compounded given the sheer number of opportunities for the Francophones to serve in their second language compared to the opportunities for the Anglophones. One survey response illustrates this very well. A unilingual Francophone officer, who had taken no English courses, was literally plunged into an English-speaking work environment and learned English on the job and was able to achieve an integral level of language proficiency.⁵⁶ Another Francophone had to take some classes in English at military college following the closure of CMR,⁵⁷ while a fellow officer had to complete their infantry training in English.⁵⁸ It is hard this way, but it is clearly illustrates the value of immersion. These opportunities for Francophones to become immersed in English arose out of necessity. The CF have not reached an equality position in this regard with respect to the Anglophones. It is mathematically impossible with a ratio of 26 % versus 74% to provide equal opportunity for immersion, but **at a minimum** the infantry FLU and ELU should have more officers from the other regiments. **The infantry skills of the officers are not the issue; rather, the language skills and understanding the different culture are.**

Motivation is another factor, which was stressed during this part of the survey dealing with education. **Motivation** was a common issue for both groups. A **lack of motivation** was attributed to several causes: first, the language course is done for direct entry officers too early in their careers, in some instances between commission and MOC training. Secondly, because they wanted to learn their main job,⁵⁹ and knew that they had to go to regimental duty after their infantry phase training was done and therefore would

⁵⁶ F-61

⁵⁷ F-47

⁵⁸ F-63

⁵⁹ F-50

not use their second language skills. Officers would not be able to practice their second language for three to four years during their first regimental tour; if they did, this occurred only if they were fortunate enough to be employed in a bilingual or other language unit. Finally there are thus perceptions of a lack of commitment by the chain of command to support and fill FLU and ELU with the other language group.⁶⁰

Another factor impeding language proficiency arose in the survey responses: at military college language education was the lowest priority since they had to work toward their bachelor degree and their military training.⁶¹ Acquiring language efficiency ranked last in their time-constrained day, given all the other activities demanding attention.⁶² Another statement was made that RMC was not even following the spirit of the regulations in place for the alternate language week at the military college. In theory, one week is supposed to be French and the other English; in practice the language of choice could be used all the time.⁶³ This could be easily solved simply by **strictly enforcing the application of the policy**. This problem eventually should be solved by the OPD since the cadets now have to be functional in order to graduate

From the 113 survey replies, a comparison was made between officers' actual proficiency level with the level required for promotion to Colonel and above. The proficiency level for Colonel and above is **superior** reading, **intermediate** writing, and **superior** oral interaction.⁶⁴ The survey showed that 12 out 48 Anglophones could be eligible for promotion having met the bilingual requirements. Likewise, for the

⁶⁰ E-42, E-9, E-12, E-37, E-38, E-46,

⁶¹ E-34

⁶² E-36

⁶³ F-42

⁶⁴ DAOD 5038-1, Officer Professional Development (OPD) System, 26 November 1997, URL: http://131.134.220.99/admfincs/subjects/DAOD/5038/1_e.asp. Accessed 31 May 2000, p10.

Francophones, 44 out of 65 would meet the requirements. This shows a major difference in ability to meet the bilingual requirement for promotion, as **25% of the Anglophones are eligible, versus 67% of the Francophones**. This is completely unrelated to their command ability and their professional skills, but **purely their ability to meet the language requirements**. It clearly demonstrates a potential problem in the future regarding promotion for the Anglophones if the official policy is enforced. You also note this is even more significant in that more French-speaking officers responded in the rank of Second Lieutenant to Major. This is indicating an even more serious problem for Anglophones, since it will have a much greater effect on their ability to be promoted in the future.

This is a major difference between the two groups and it would suggest that there might be a real problem with regards to language training. Both groups are definitely not on equal status from the percentage comparisons. From an examination of the data, this could partly be the result of inaccessibility to meaningful training. According to the figures gathered, Anglophones are certainly taking more courses than the Francophones. However, the majority is not provided with an opportunity to work in their second language to maintain or improve their newly acquired skills; equally important, the immersion in the French culture, the environment that would enhance their language skills is also lacking.

It would be very easy to ignore this in light of the mathematical impossibility of employing all the Anglophones in bilingual positions. But the fact is that the infantry units (ELU, FLU) are far below the 20 % permissible intake of the other language group. A meaningful effort should be made to ensure this happens. In order to do this, there

would be a necessity to reduce rivalries between regiments, or simply reorganized to adequately support the two-language groups in accordance with the law. Most officers would prefer to stay in their own regiment in order to be seen and evaluated by them, as well as being comfortable within the regimental family.

In summary, there is definitely an inequity in officer professional development between the two groups in terms of attaining promotion requirements. To improve this situation, one recommendation would be to provide better accessibility for Anglophones to **learn in an immersion environment**. Secondly, the teaching program is more than adequate but **time should be allocated exclusively for second language learning**; stated in another way, language should become the primary duty so other duties do not interfere with learning. A third recommendation would be to require **a more adequate distribution of officers in ELU and FLU** so as fulfil the 20% allowed by the governing regulations. More promotion of the use of the two official languages by BU in day to day operations should also be done. A final recommendation, and perhaps the most attainable, would be to address the motivation issue raised in the survey by providing all officers with better opportunities to actually obtain **follow up employment** in their second language upon completion of a course.

Section 2: Analyzing questions 3 & 4

Question 3: Have you ever worked in your second language? If yes, for how long and in what position? Any problems?

Question 4: Based upon your experience both within your MOC and in the CF in general do you believe that English and French have equality of status in their usage? Please explain.

The opportunities available for French and English speakers to work in their second language are quite different for each group. According to the survey, **33% of the Anglophones never have had an opportunity to work in their second language!** In contrast, **100% of the Francophones have had** the opportunity to work in the English language. Converted to percentages for months of service, the average Anglophone works 20 months in their second language as compared to 62 months for the Francophones.

For Anglophones infantry officers who have had the chance to work in their second language, most of this occurred in schools. The Infantry School, Royal Military College, and basic officer training schools are examples of this. Operations and exercises, abroad or in Canada, are other opportunities where officers occasionally were able to work in their second language. Headquarters, and the now disbanded Airborne Regiment, were also among the opportunities mentioned. The unfortunate Airborne Regiment was a unique opportunity as it was the only bilingual operational infantry unit in the Army. Francophone respondents have plenty of opportunities to work in their second language. Notably, all the Francophone respondents to the survey, even the unilingual, had worked in an English environment at some point during their careers. It is therefore evident that the **Francophones have more opportunities to work in their**

second language. Therefore, this gives them a greater opportunity to acquire, enhance, or simply maintain their language profile.

When the question was raised about the **equality of status** in their MOC and in the CF, there seems to be diverse opinion within both groups. The replies can be divided into three groups: “yes”, “no”, and “yes and no.” The majority of answers were “no” from 77% of the Anglophone respondents and a similar response of 79% from the Francophones. The equality status was viewed as “yes” by 15% Anglophone versus 9% Francophone respondents, and the “yes and no” was 8% versus 12% respectively. A **common consensus** emerged that **there is not an equality of status**.

The other similarity from both groups is the comments: the English language has a definite predominance. From the Francophone perspective, it is simply a reality of life especially in light of international commerce and English currently being the Internet language.⁶⁵ Another wrote, there is an apparent improvement from the past but English is still predominant.⁶⁶ A third officer commented that both languages in theory have the equality of status in Canada, however in their daily application this is not true outside Quebec.⁶⁷ Overall, it seems easier to work in English to ensure that everyone does understand more quickly since more Francophones are bilingual. The predominance is **a result of sheer number of Anglophones** outside Quebec.⁶⁸

The majority of correspondence is conducted in English in the CF. There are many reasons to explain this. First and foremost, if a document is sent in French, it first has to be translated which takes time; therefore simply sending it in English is more

⁶⁵ F-1

⁶⁶ F-4

⁶⁷ F-9

⁶⁸ F-27

efficient.⁶⁹ One respondent further stated: a perception exists at National Defense Headquarters (NDHQ), in order to be taken seriously or have a project go through, it is strongly recommended to have it done in English. The work is therefore produced in English so the author avoids being perceived as a troublemaker which could have career repercussions; this is an unspoken rule.⁷⁰ Survey respondents also stated that there is at least one branch which essentially does not offer bilingual services at all, in noting that some instances the document appeared a year later in French. This dispels the fact that in accordance with the Official Language Act all documents are to be sent simultaneously in both languages.⁷¹

Most Francophone respondents perceived that they are bearing the responsibility for bilingualism.⁷² Furthermore, the fact that most Francophones are, at a minimum, functional, does not automatically guarantee that they can produce documents as well in their second language nor as fast as they would in their first language. It is more demanding for the Francophones in this situation to communicate as well and as effectively as his English counterpart. Yet, Francophones are expected to do the writing as well and as quickly as the Anglophones.⁷³

The responsibility for bilingualism is being borne in most cases by the Francophone. He/she is expected to be bilingual but the opposite is not true.⁷⁴ It is a double-edged problem, especially with regard to translation. In order to have the document available in both languages the Francophones usually personally does this

⁶⁹ F-16

⁷⁰ F-50

⁷¹ F-30, F-46, F-52, F-57, F-60

⁷² F-9, F-43, F-47, F-49, F-53, F-63

⁷³ F-59

⁷⁴ F-43

work. There is a translation service, but it is overwhelmed; therefore the burden of translation is shouldered by the Francophone author.⁷⁵ The problem with this is two fold: first, the officer is not an official translator and does he have the additional time required to spend doing the translation; secondly, the quality of the translation is not as proficient, which in turn produces translation errors.

The French translation of a document is sometimes unavailable for a long period of time, therefore Francophones are either working from old documents or inadequately translated ones. This results in a difference in standards. Yet the official documents must be published in both language simultaneously when they are to be applied to both language groups. As one officer commented, one problem is that most Francophone officers are accustomed to the delays in translation, hence they have therefore stopped emphasizing the importance of simultaneous publication of official documents.⁷⁶

Meetings are another example of poor enforcement of the bilingualism policy. Too often an Anglophone senior officer gives a brief and starts with “bonjour”⁷⁷ then the entire briefing is conducted in English. The example must come from the top and this is not necessarily the case at NDHQ.⁷⁸ For example, at the briefing for the redeployment of units from FLU 5^e Groupe Brigade Mecanise du Canada (5^eGBMC) from Yugoslavia, all, but one of the 27 members in attendance were French. The one Anglophone was unilingual, but represented the National Command Element hence the briefing was given

⁷⁵ F-31

⁷⁶ F-52

⁷⁷ F-12

⁷⁸ F-63

in English. The survey member perceived this to be insulting to the Francophones and systemic discrimination.⁷⁹

English predominance concerning equality of status is recognized from the Anglophone perspective as well. It is a great challenge to be bilingual, especially to achieve it as an adult. Since English predominance is recognized by both communities, therefore it is the language of default.⁸⁰ Furthermore, there is no requirement to speak French at work in an ELU or at headquarters.⁸¹ This statement reinforces the fact that the CF do not have enough Francophones in the ELU. Filling these spaces would facilitate the exchange.

One officer listed four reasons for this imbalance: The predominance of English is explained by critical mass,⁸² the lack of opportunities outside Quebec to use French, English is the operational language, and Canada's allies operate in English.⁸³ Another Anglophone officer commented, it seems that there is "lip service paid by many, particularly at higher rank levels by throwing in the token line in French or the repetition of a complete statement. It is done to satisfy some perceived requirement rather than a genuine desire to communicate the message in both languages."⁸⁴ This responsibility is attributable equally to both sides: To save time, a Francophone will switch into English, thus stealing an opportunity for the Anglophones to practice in his second language. There are also examples of Francophone speaking to each other in English.⁸⁵

⁷⁹ F-62

⁸⁰ E-10

⁸¹ E-13

⁸² E-9

⁸³ E-49

⁸⁴ E-3

⁸⁵ E-1

It is recognized that it is difficult to be motivated to use the second language when one is outside Quebec and there is very little interaction possible in French.⁸⁶ There is also an erroneous assumption that most Francophones outside Quebec are bilingual because they have better access to language school.⁸⁷ This is untrue if the proportion of the courses taken by each language group discussed earlier is considered. The problem is: Anglophones have difficulty in maintaining their skills once a course is completed because they are posted back to an English environment. Yet Francophones have to share the responsibility and make an effort to converse in French when an Anglophone is trying to practice. However, too often they automatically switch to English to be more efficient. To compound the problem, there is an insufficient effort to send course graduates to bilingual positions after their language course. For example, in one instance it took four years to send a graduate to a bilingual position following his course.⁸⁸ Therefore, efforts are not made to **fill the bilingual positions appropriately**, something that would help generate more French-English interaction.

The impact of this difference is felt in career competitiveness. For the Francophones, it seems in some instances more difficult to compete on the same level **early** in their careers. Francophone officers must be bilingual in order to compete for promotions and assignment opportunities, yet the opposite is not true.⁸⁹ It seems that the Francophones have to do more since they are more efficient in both languages therefore more employable.⁹⁰ Therefore some feel at a disadvantage, especially early in their

⁸⁶ E-26

⁸⁷ E-20

⁸⁸ E-37, E-38, F-15, F-55

⁸⁹ F-10

⁹⁰ F-57

careers when they have not mastered the English language very well. However the implications are clear: **Overtime the Francophone will eventually have the advantage.**

The impact is different on Anglophone officers. Proficiency in a second language is seen as an asset for overseas employment.⁹¹ The fact that the Francophones are always reverting to English in conversations with colleagues makes it easier for them to maintain their proficiency. However, one French officer asserted that the assimilation of the Francophone in his professional life into the English-speaking world reduced his proficiency in French and in his professional vocabulary, thus hindering equality.⁹² There are also questions raised like, “Why should I learn French if I am going to spend most of my career out West?”⁹³ Another demotivator for Anglophones occurs when mistakes are quickly noted to them, this does not incline them to maintain their skill.⁹⁴

The lack of equality has a definite impact on the different career courses. The Francophones feel disadvantaged when they have to compete on equal status in their second language very early in their career. For instance, RMC is considered bilingual, but most of the engineering books are only produced in English.⁹⁵ It is the same when there is only one Francophone taking a course. For example, in advance mortar training, because of the small number of students the one Francophone is forced to take the course in English.⁹⁶ When there are enough Francophones for the course, there is concern that the course material will not be held to a common standard when it has to be conducted in both languages.⁹⁷

⁹¹ E-35

⁹² E-9

⁹³ E-25

⁹⁴ E-43

⁹⁵ F-43

⁹⁶ F-47

⁹⁷ E-22

Early in their careers some Francophone respondents stated they were force-fed English. This results in an initial feeling of inferiority because it is harder to be productive in the second language. From the beginning there is a feeling of resentment that the Francophone must be bilingual and that the Anglophones does not have to meet the same requirement.⁹⁸ Still, this forces Francophone officers to perfect their second language skill throughout their careers, voluntarily or involuntarily. At the CF Command and Staff College there is the odd lecture in French with simultaneous English translation, but not the reverse.⁹⁹ There have been some improvements, but it is still a constant struggle for the Francophones.

This difference between the two groups on the bilingualism issue generates tension. The fact that there is always the possibility for a waiver of the proficiency requirement for promotion to higher rank does nothing to address the issue. Especially when a senior officer who by his/her rank has the requirement to speak in the other language is far from functional.¹⁰⁰ One possible solution could be to emulate the Belgium Armed Forces where, in order to become an officer, one has to be bilingual with no exception.¹⁰¹ Changes like these have to be mandated and implemented by the chain of command from the top down. These will only be effective if the leadership lives by its own policies. Since it is the law that one can communicate to his/her troop in either official language, this would mean that **the leadership would have to lead by example** and make the effort to apply equally bilingualism policies. It would mean filling the appropriate bilingual positions. Then the ELU and FLU would be also be manned in the proper

⁹⁸ F-38

⁹⁹ F-46

¹⁰⁰ F-58

¹⁰¹ F-64

representation of Anglophones and Francophones, which provides immersion opportunities needed to maintain second language proficiencies.

The bottom line is that for Francophones there is a point where they have no choice but to learn English if they want to progress. Conversely, Anglophones have to constantly struggle to find any opportunity to practice their second language in order to maintain their profile for promotion, generally without adequate support from the CF.

Section 3: Analyzing questions 5 & 6 & 7

Question 5: Do you feel you ever have been discriminated against as a result of your lack of knowledge in your second language? Please explain.

Question 6: What could be done in order to improve the system?

Question 7: Additional comments.

The last part of the survey was designed to investigate whether any of the respondents felt that the lack of a second language led to discrimination and what suggestions they might have to improve the system. The **Anglophones** perspective is interesting: **33% felt that they had been discriminated against** during their careers, 61% felt they had never been discriminated against, and 6% were undecided. Although this will be covered in more depth later, the main factors identified as source of perceived discrimination affected a lack of career advancement in not being posted to a position where they could practice their second language after courses were completed. Other issues were “train to need,” exchange positions not being filled, and a leadership issue versus a career development issue.

The **Francophones** perspective produced a surprise: there seemed to be less feeling of discrimination than reported by their Anglophone contemporaries. The survey shows that **14% felt that they have been discriminated against** during their career, 80% felt they had never have been discriminated against, and 6% were undecided. The main concerns were that career advancement opportunities were primarily in English, they were forced to work in English, and, although translation of English orders/regulations into French is a requirement of the CF, this was not well understood or applied consistently. However, the majority feel they **have a bilingual advantage** over

their Anglophone counterparts. They all indicated a desire for the policy of operating in the two official languages to be firmly and equitably applied, according to the law.

The discrepancy between Anglophones and Francophones with regard to the perception of discrimination must be addressed. Francophones feel less discrimination than Anglophones in the day-to-day operations. This could be easily explained by the fact that Francophones have no other choice than to learn as early as possible the second language because they will have to interact much more with Anglophones. The fact that the MOC training and other courses are not all offered in French leaves the Francophones with no alternative if he/she wants to succeed in this environment. Proficiency in the second language becomes a career “**must**” for the Francophones, yet the opposite is not true for the Anglophones.¹⁰² Upon enrolment 88% of Anglophones respondent were unilingual compared to 47% for the Francophones. Of course, **once the Francophone gains bilingual status, this is no longer an issue** for their career development and advancement.

The “no alternative” reality can be explained in one statement: **bilingualism is a one way street at two speeds**. The great majority of bilingual officers are Francophone. The best example is NDHQ, a bilingual unit, where unilingual Francophones can not work in French but Anglophones can and are operating in a defacto purely English-speaking environment. NDHQ allows those holding ranks of Colonel and above to still be promoted without the minimal language proficiency requirement with a three-year waiver. As one Francophone officer postulated, this ultimately brings them to retirement without ever achieving the linguistic proficiency required.¹⁰³ This is interpreted by the

¹⁰² F-19

¹⁰³ F-6

survey respondents as a lack of commitment at the leadership level, while some assess the CF are only providing lip service to the policy by allowing individuals to achieve personal career objectives yet not leading by example.¹⁰⁴

The 14% of Francophones that feel discriminated against believed they are not being given equal opportunity for courses. In French assisted courses (English course but with some classes where all the Francophones are being grouped together), they are being penalized because they have to do more work to obtain the same quality of success than their counterpart.¹⁰⁵ The same feelings of discrimination are found in the work environment where some feel that it is harder to communicate while seeking to attain the same quality of work as their Anglophone counterparts, hence they find themselves at a disadvantage.¹⁰⁶ Notably this **feeling disappears once the Francophones becomes fully bilingual**. There is one perceived negative effect to the immersion in an English operating environment. Francophones, in deferring to English lose their own first language proficiency in writing. Still, conclusion 14% versus 33% (Francophones perception of discrimination versus Anglophones), **Anglophones in general must struggle longer with the issue than the Francophones does.**

There is some common ground for both groups. They both stated that it is harder to practice French for the members living and working in the Western provinces. The opportunities for immersion are simply not available, and the attitude to French is quite different in that part of Canada. In general, personnel in Western units do not see the usefulness of learning the second language since they do not have to use it in their daily operations. It is also counter productive to spend money on language training if one

¹⁰⁴ E-9, E-18, F-4, F-6, F-11, F14, F-22, F-25, F-34, F-43, F-45, F-49, F-53, F-58, F-60, F-62, F-63

¹⁰⁵ F-8

never is given the opportunity to work in the second language. In this situation then, there is a stronger requirement and more opportunity for Francophones to become bilingual than for Anglophones,¹⁰⁷ as the former receives a posting in the Western, Central, or Eastern parts of Canada in an unilingual English environment. Anglophones feel discrimination because they are not given equal opportunity to be immersed in their second language, which is in part a mathematical reality as Francophones are guaranteed to be served in their second language and the Anglophones are not.¹⁰⁸ This again strongly reemphasizes the importance of filling the 20% in FLU, and ELU units.

The biggest issue is the direct link between promotion and bilingualism. Too much importance is placed on the requirement for language proficiency, which influences promotion opportunities. If there is not an equal opportunity for learning the language, then it should not be part of the equation for promotion. The survey responses with respect to course attendance noted an average of two courses was taken by Anglophones versus 1.1 by Francophones. It is fair to say that the courses are available, but the negative side is in the lack of follow up and where most of the French language basic is thought. **Most Anglophones will not get an opportunity to work in their second language after attending course, therefore they will have difficulty maintaining their newly acquired skills.**

Some respondents also stated that language training is counter-productive and a major dissatisfaction for personnel. This results in considerable resistance to the whole idea of bilingualism. The universal requirement for bilingualism within the CF is associated with **negative reinforcement**. It is perceived as an irrational expenditure of

¹⁰⁶ F-46

¹⁰⁷ E-2

financial resources, especially in the current state of cutbacks to the defense budget. It was strongly recommended by nine Anglophone respondents to drop the formalized requirement for bilingualism.¹⁰⁹ The career managers are pressing for acquiring a better balance in the language profiles for the officers, yet it is felt that this is very hard to achieve. Ironically, for those interested in taking courses it is also hard to get into a course: either because the individual does not fall into the prerequisite established for it due to his/her current language profile or because the commanding officer will not let the officer attend since he/she is too important to the unit because of their assignment.

There is also dissatisfaction with the **time frame** in which the courses are given. A good example of this is the policy of language training before MOC training, which can be seen to be a significant investment in an unproven individual.¹¹⁰ The officer cadet might fail in his classification training, therefore preventing others already trained to attend courses and improve their linguistic profiles. It is perceived as a waste of resources for those not yet MOC trained.

What can be done to **improve the system**? Possible recommendations or solutions to identified problems have appeared in the analysis of the surveys. At first glance there are similarities in some of the proposed improvements from both language groups. The most significant recommendation is providing for **immersion** in the second language following course attendance. This could be achieved by providing more **bilingual positions**, or to **maximize the filling of those already available**. As mentioned earlier, in the case of the FLU and ELU the battalions should have their

¹⁰⁸ E-20

¹⁰⁹ E-44, E-14, E-16, E-17, E-22, E-31, E-37, E-46, E-47

¹¹⁰ E-11

maximum 20% bilingual positions filled; this is clearly not happening. The bilingual positions in the BU should be strictly enforced as well.

Since **immersion seems to be the key** for improving proficiency levels, an effort should be made to ensure that immediately after a language course graduates are actually posted to a unit or environment where they can improve their newly acquired second language skills. Since it is a mathematical impossibility to provide a position for every officer, efforts should be made to increase small unit **exchanges at the sub sub-unit level** between FLU and ELU. This would provide opportunities for Anglophones and Francophones to work together and practice their second language, in both work and social environment. It would be essential, however, that there is not an automatic deferral to English. The effort would have to come from both sides. This would hopefully lead to a better understanding of each group's concern and points of view.

Respondent recommendations can be summed up in the following manner. Attendance at a language course should be treated in the same way **as postgraduate studies**: the officer is removed from the unit in order to concentrate fully on his/her studies. Course work must occur in an **immersion environment** and be immediately **followed by a posting** to practice and improve the newly acquired language skills. **Leadership should lead by example**, so it is only proper for leaders to insure their subordinates understand them.¹¹¹ All of these come from a basic restated premise: the CF's current commitment to bilingualism can be described as easy to legislate but hard to enforce.

However, there are also **substantial differences** in the **proposed solutions for each group**, some of which are contradictory. The main difference revolves around

promotion. Several Anglophones respondents suggested that the language issue should be solved at the leadership level rather than directly linked to career development. Hence, the responsibility of the officer is to find a way to achieve the required proficiency levels without much help from the system.¹¹² **Anglophones** in general feel, in the absence of change to the systemic issues, that language proficiency should **not be a prerequisite for promotion**. **Francophones** also feel strongly about leadership contributing to the problem, but not in the same way. Francophones feel the leader should lead by example, by being bilingual, and that the policy of meeting language requirements should **be enforced fully**. Failure to do so means no promotion, or no “acting lacking.” Fundamentally, the Francophone position is that the letter of the law should be strictly enforced.

Anglophones are more willing to have the **language profile requirements lowered** to allow promotion.¹¹³ The recommendation of **training to need** seems to be very strong from the Anglophone respondents. The scenario suggested is that by identifying personnel early in their careers who would require second language abilities, training could then be focused on these specific officers only. This concept of “training to need” implies the suggestion to focus only on those with the perceived potential to reach higher rank, such as brigade commanders. The language profile requirement should not be in the equation for promotion before the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.¹¹⁴ There is consensus from the Anglophone respondents that there is **too much emphasis on bilinguism**. It is important to recall that this Anglophone view could be directly

¹¹¹ E-18

¹¹² E-14

¹¹³ E-11

¹¹⁴ E-21

linked to the fact that, at the time of the survey, only 25% of the Anglophones with their actual profile could be promoted to Colonel and above versus 67% of Francophones.

It must be stated that generally Anglophones are as quick to opt to learn a second language as Francophone. Some Anglophones are drawn to the “train to need” idea because of the lack of opportunity for second language immersion. Points of frustration were identified by Anglophones who felt that they do not have access to the same tools as the Francophones, yet the language requirements for promotion are the same. To fully “man” the authorized extra regimental exchange positions would be one way to alleviate some of the frustrations and inequities.

The **Francophone** respondents provided some **different possible options** as well. One recommendation was that all **courses** should be conducted in **both languages**.¹¹⁵ This would ensure that all the officers are able to have all training and education in the language of choice. To further this idea, the courses could be conducted by alternating both languages (on a daily/weekly basis, or modeled on the military colleges’ alternating language weeks), from basic training throughout the career. It would equally force each group to learn the second language, instead of only those interested in learning the other language. Although this would result in additional work on each side, it would provide a better understanding of each other’s language. It would also provide the immersion environment both see as a requirement for success. **Alternating language instruction** would be achievable, but it would probably require more time and money. There are already bilingual instructors but an augmentation would be required. Implementing alternate language instruction on all courses would be difficult; however, the long-term benefits would make it worthwhile.

Another **common issue** identified by both linguistic groups was the **lack of leadership by example** by senior officers. A first step in the solution for this would be to mandate that at least once a year each member of a BU must provide one briefing in his/her second language. Faced with this situation, officers would hopefully acquire an understanding for the difficulty faced by members of the CF trying to operate in or encourage a bilingual corps, this would provide an impetus for improvement. A further suggestion could be to impose a **percentage of compulsory** Francophone activities in a BU.¹¹⁶ Briefings now given in the BU are de facto being delivered in English. Although in courses like CF Command and Staff College there is automatic translation available, why not make it a policy to deliver **more briefings in French**? It would be an easy way to increase the opportunities for Anglophone language practice. The intent of the suggestions would be to reduce the overwhelming and automatic deferral to English in the work environment.

The **enforcement** of the policy is the biggest problem. One possible option may be to **centralize the control system** for the whole CF instead of having it at the command level.¹¹⁷ This might ensure more uniformity in the application of the policy and holding all to one standard. Centralization would also minimize duplicating effort and reduce the operational costs of administering the second language programs.

Clearly from the respondents' perspective, this has to **“start from the top down.”**¹¹⁸ Without leadership buy-in, the success of even many small initiatives would fail. It is, therefore, essential to provide the tools equally to Francophones and

¹¹⁵ F-61

¹¹⁶ F-3

¹¹⁷ F-13

¹¹⁸ F-63

Anglophones and encourage the implementation of all of the possible small solutions that could enhance the system. The Francophone is a bit more vehement that language proficiency is tied to promotion and it should, therefore, be enforced and not circumvented.¹¹⁹ Whatever solution or solutions are put in place, success can only be achieved through the adoption of these solutions by the leadership.

There is a real need to **positively reinforce efforts** made to meet bilingualism targets.¹²⁰ This could be accomplished by identifying interesting postings outside the country requiring bilingual officers. For example, “Le Cours d’Ecole de Guerre” at Paris is currently a posting opportunity identified for unilingual or bilingual Francophones. This opportunity does not necessarily have to be a Francophone position. This opportunity could be seen as an incentive to become bilingual. Another suggestion, similar to the other government departments could be **monetary incentive for being bilingual**. The British were doing it as early as the 19th century, and the US Marines are doing it today. The aim of any of the recommended solutions would be to remove the negative elements associated with the proficiency level. Providing positive **incentives** would also help in the motivation of CF members to learn a second language rather than force the issue through legislation and policies that either cannot be enforced, therefore cannot be attained, or **“force fed”** to reluctant members of the CF.

¹¹⁹ F-60

¹²⁰ F-22

Conclusion

The **proposed research question** was this: to ascertain if French and English have equality of status in the infantry officer corps of the Canadian Armed Forces. If not, what could be done to improve it? The answer from both Anglophones and Francophones infantry officers was “**no**”. The Anglophones and Francophones replied at 77% and 79%, representing in essence agreement. According to the law, both languages have equality of status, but in practice it is not the case outside of Quebec.

From the analysis of the survey responses, an important but derailing issue was raised: the proficiency requirement for promotion. From the respondent profiles it showed that **25% of the Anglophones versus 67% are eligible for promotion to the rank of Colonel and above**. These statistics demonstrate a clear problem with the actual policy with regards to Anglophone promotion in the near future, especially in the CF, which is one of the unifying institutions of the Canadian nation. It is a potential problem with ethnic proportion as a whole versus promotion in the CF if the equal representation is to be maintained. Therefore, **urgent action** must be taken to eliminate this problem if we do not want to impede the officer of the Officer Corps of the Infantry.

The analyses also showed that the language courses are available and, contrary to some beliefs, the Anglophones have attended on average almost twice as many as Francophones (2 versus 1.1 course on average). Motivation to learn was not a major issue, but differences appear associated with other difficulties. For instance, **time and location** were concerns. Many language courses were given prior to MOC training, when motivation was focused on acquiring initial professional skills and not a second

language. Also the fact that officers were sent to learn their second language without an immersion environment was seen by many as an irritant and a waste of resources. Three and six month's courses were also perceived as of limited value. The courses should be **longer than six months** in order to acquire a firmer grasp of the second language. The courses should also be taught in a full **immersion** cultural and societal environment. Linked to this, they disassociated from their work place and be a **student is primary duty**.

A major irritant toward learning the second language was the **lack of follow up posting within immersion environment**. Agreement prevails that there is a requirement to be immersed for a consecutive period in order to have any hope of mastering the language. Following formal language study, the officers should be sent to an environment where they can work in their second language, either a BU or FLU, or ELU, as appropriate. Hence notable differences appear amongst the respondents. The figures speak for themselves: 33% of the Anglophones never had an opportunity to work in their second language, while all the Francophones did. Thus, Anglophones encounter problems in maintaining their skills without a post-course posting to a second language unit (FLU or BU).

The lack of second language abilities led to a sense of discrimination for 33% of the Anglophones versus only 14% of the Francophones. The lack of translated documents, courses are sometimes unavailable in French, and the lip service for meetings with the fall back always being English all this creates a sense of discrimination than from some Francophones. One would believe the Francophones would feel oppressed, yet the opposite is true; one explanation for this could be that the Francophones have no

choice but to struggle with the language early in their careers in order to succeed while the opposite is not the case. **Once they reach the integral level, language becomes a non-issue for them.** The Anglophone struggle to master the French language is a much longer journey which requires constant effort to maintain often without being given the opportunity to do so, e.g. immersion opportunity.

Proposed solutions from both groups are **centered on the need for immersion environment.** Since it is mathematically impossible to have all the Anglophones in immersion, smaller solutions could be implemented. For example, ensure the FLU, ELU, and BU 20% quotas are fully staffed, currently only one officer from sister regiment in the infantry battalions illustrating a lack of exchange officers from the other regiments. Another would be to maximize sub sub-unit exchange between the regiments. An effort from both sides should be made to avoid the automatic fall back to English as the language of choice. Above all, emphasis should be coming from the top down through **leadership by example.**

The policy for language requirement in the letter of the law should **be enforced fully** with no “acting lacking” exemptions. With this current evasion of policy, possible damage to the unity in the CF as this perceived advantage is given to the Anglophones over Francophones since only 25% of them could be promoted with actual proficiency requirement with out the “acting lacking.” The horns of the dilemma is that removing the “acting lacking” will be perceived as discrimination toward the Anglophones since they did not have the same immersion, and posting opportunities as the Francophones did.

Other proposed solutions are very specific for each group, and this is directly related to promotion. Some **Anglophones** would suggest that the language **not be a**

requirement for promotion, rather, the language requirement could be **lowered for promotion**, since not all the same tools are available to the Anglophones as they are for the Francophones. The idea of “train to need,” providing language course only to those whom will need it in their future employment, is also generated by the lack of second language immersion opportunities.

Francophones conversely are **firmer** with regard to the criteria for promotion. It must be **applied to the letter of the law**. Since the Francophones have had to struggle initially but become integral faster, an option for lessening difference with both groups would be to conduct all the **courses in alternating both language**. Both groups would **have to struggle equally**, but an immersion atmosphere would be generated which would benefit both. The BU should have a percentage of activity in French and not always fall back on English. The intent would be to **reduce the overwhelming and automatic deferment to English** in the work environment.

The **enforcement** of the policy is the **biggest problem**; the **key is leadership**. The policy has to be implement from the top down. The Official Language Act is in effect, but not enforced. NDHQ should be in the lead to implement it. If the leaders are **not willing to fully implement it this policy, it should be amended**. Providing only lip service is a detriment to the moral of the officers and accomplishment of the stated official goals.

APPENDIX A:

Covering letter and survey sample (English)

Marine Corps University
2076 South Street
Quantico, VA 22134-5070

September 2000

BILINGUALISM IN THE LAND FORCE

I am the Canadian student at the Marine Corps Command and Staff College for the 2000-01 academic year. As part of the requirement for a Masters in Military Studies I have to complete a thesis. I have chosen to study the effects of the policy of bilingualism primarily on the officers of the Corps of Infantry, and General officers. There is much controversy with the way this policy is being applied and I would like to have a clear picture of our current status in order to reach a conclusion as to its effectiveness and perhaps offer some recommendations to improve or change it. .

To complete this study, I need a database. I request your assistance by completing the attached survey. Your anonymity will be kept. I am looking for the collective officers of the Corps of Infantry and General officers perspective, the pulse in 2000, primarily from both Anglophone and Francophone infantry officers.

I understand that your schedule is full, but it would be greatly appreciated if you could take few minutes to share your views on this issue. Thank you very much for your support.

JRG Melancon
Major
USMC University

Distribution List

DLP6/ Elizabeth Allard
RCR
R22ER
PPCLI
CTC

USMC UNIVERSITY
SURVEY
MAJ JRG MELANCON
AY 2000-01

Rank: _____

Name: _____

DOB: _____

Primary language: (French/ English)

Language profile: _____

Entry program: _____

Years of service: _____

MOC: _____

1. On enrollment were you unilingual or bilingual? If the latter where did you receive your language instruction? _____

2. Have you had **official** second language training? If so how for long, where and when? What were the strengths and/or weaknesses of this program?

3. Have you ever worked in your second language? If yes, for how long and in what position? Any problems?

4. Based upon your experience both within your MOC and in the CF in general do you believe that English and French have equality of status in their usage? Please explain.

5. Do you feel you ever have been discriminated against as a result of your lack of knowledge in your second language? Please explain.

6. What could be done in order to improve the system?

7. Additional comments:

APPENDIX B:

Covering letter and survey sample (French)

Marine Corps University
2076 South Street
Quantico, VA 22134-5070

Le septembre 2000

BILINGUISME AU SEIN DE LA FORCE TERRESTRE

Je suis l'officier canadien actuellement inscrit au Collège d'état-major du Corps des Marines à l'université USMC à Quantico pour l'année scolaire 2000-01. Dans le cadre des préalables au programme de maîtrise en études militaires, je dois rédiger une thèse. J'ai donc choisi de traiter de l'incidence de la politique sur les langues officielles sur les officiers du Corps d'infanterie en particulier, ainsi que ceux des officiers Généraux. La façon dont cette politique est appliquée provoque une vive controverse. J'aimerais par conséquent avoir une idée précise de la situation afin d'être en mesure de juger de l'efficacité de la politique et de formuler des recommandations, le cas échéant.

Je dois toutefois disposer d'une banque de données pour mener à bien ce projet. Je vous saurais gré de m'accorder votre appui en remplissant le sondage ci-joint. L'information recueillie sera traitée dans la plus stricte confidentialité. Mon but premier est de découvrir le point de vue global des officiers du Corps d'infanterie en particulier, ainsi que ceux des officiers Généraux, tant Francophones qu'Anglophones, et de prendre le pouls de la situation en l'an 2000.

Je comprends que votre horaire est très chargé, mais je vous serais fort reconnaissant de bien vouloir prendre quelques minutes pour remplir ce sondage. Je vous remercie à l'avance de votre précieuse collaboration.

JRG Melancon
Major
USMC University

Liste de distribution :

DPFT/ Elizabeth Allard
RCR
R22ER
PPCLI
CIC

UNIVERSITE USMC
SONDAGE
MAJ JRG MELANCON
AA 2000-01

Grade : _____

Nom : _____

DDN : _____

Langue première : (français / anglais)

Profil linguistique : _____

Programme d' enrôlement : _____

Années de service : _____

GPM : _____

1. Étiez-vous unilingue ou bilingue au moment de votre enrôlement dans les FC?
Comment avez-vous appris votre langue seconde, s'il y a lieu?

2. Avez-vous reçu une formation **officielle** en langue seconde? Si oui, pendant combien de temps et à quel endroit? Quels étaient les points forts et les points faibles du programme?

3. Avez-vous eu l'occasion de travailler dans votre langue seconde durant votre carrière? Si oui, pendant combien de temps et à quel endroit? Y a-t-il eu des problèmes?

4. Selon vous, l'anglais et le français ont-ils égalité de statut au sein du ministère de la Défense nationale et des Forces canadiennes? Veuillez préciser.

5. Selon vous, avez-vous déjà été victime de discrimination à cause de votre manque de connaissance de la langue seconde? Veuillez préciser.

6. À votre avis, comment pourrait-on améliorer le système actuel?

7. Commentaires additionnels :

APPENDIX C:
DEFINITION OF TERMS

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Acting lacking

An officer promoted without having the bilingual requirement for his new rank. He received a waiver by the exemption authority. He has three years to acquire the proper linguistic profile for his rank.

Anglophone (English-speaking person)

Any person, of whatever ethnic group or mother tongue, whose first official language is English.

Bilingual Units (BU)

BUs are manned overall by 74% Anglophones and 26% Francophones in proportion to the national representative group ratio. The work environment must be conducive to the effective use of both official languages, enabling their personal to use either one.

English Language Units (ELU)

ELUs are made up primarily of anglophones, and represent a wide spectrum of operational units. Francophones with the requisite language skill may serve in ELUs, their proportion of the unit strength to not normally exceed 20%.

Francophone (French-Speaking person)

Any person, of whatever ethnic origin or mother tongue, whose first official language is French.

First Official language

The official language with which an employee has a primary personnel identification (that is, the official language in which the person is generally more proficient).

French Language units (FLU)

FLUs are made up primarily of Francophones. Anglophones with the requisite language skill may serve in FLUs, their proportion of the unit strength to not normally exceed 20%.

Linguistic degree

Is a simple way to indicate the linguistic requirement by one letter, although in the past it was four numbers. These are attributed following a test. In order to be tested, the member must have followed a second language course, or worked in his/her second language for a year. This test is done every five years until the Integral level is reached: once integral has reached, there is no longer a requirement for testing.

Integral (I) the highest proficiency level: A4 and B4

Functional (F) A3 and B3

Unspecified Language Units (ULU)

ULUs language of work is driven by factors unrelated to the official language program (such as units attached to a NORAD or NATO headquarters); or they simply exist only on paper.

Train to need

Is a common expression designated by the officers in the survey; it relates to the need to train in the second language only for those eventually required to use it. This phrase is not an officially accepted definition.

APPENDIX D:

ACRONYMS

ACRONYMS

BU	Bilingual Unit
CF	Canadian Forces
CFB	Canadian Force Base
CMR	College Militaire Royal
DLP 6	Director of Land Personal Office
DOL	Director of Official Languages
ELU	English Language Unit
FLU	French Language Unit
MOC	Military Occupation Classification
NCO	Non commissioned Officer
NDHQ	National Defense Headquarters in Ottawa
OPD	Officer Professional Development
PER	Performance Evaluation Report
PPCLI	Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry
RCR	Royal Canadian Regiment
R22 ^e R	Royal 22 ^e Regiment
RMC	Royal Military College
Sub sub-unit	is referred as platoon size organization
ULU	Unspecified Language Unit
5 ^e GBMC	5 ^e Groupe Brigade Mecanise du Canada

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SURVEY

The survey was the **primary source of information** to answer the question the basic research on the status of languages and bilingualism in the Canadian Infantry Officer Corps in 2000. The seven survey questions focused on the following: language level of the officer upon its enrolment, his/her current proficiency level, the courses he/she took in the second language, his/her perception of the equality of French and English in their usage at work, possible discrimination, and finally what could be done to improve the system. English and French language copies of the surveys are in appendix A and B.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Secondary sources were used for this MMS paper, in the *short* historic background section. The main works used were on the books written by Jean Pariseau and Serge Bernier, which assessed the involvement of French Canadians in the Canadian armed forces 1763 to 1987. Their work gave a clear understanding of changes from the British conquest to today's situation from the Francophone prospective. Two other work provided additional information: the "History of the Royal 22^e Regiment" was also used, written by an officers committee from the regiment, and the memoirs of General Jean V. Allard, in collaboration with Serge Bernier,

Bernier Serge ed., Memoires du General Jean V. Allard, (Ottawa, Les editions de Mortagne, 1985).

Castonguay Jacques, Les Bataillons et le Depot du Royal 22e Regiment, (Quebec, Regie de Royal 22e Regiment, 1974).

Coles, World History 1650 to the present Notes, (Coles Publishing Company Limited, 1981).

Pariseau Jean et Bernier Serge, Les Canadiens Francais et le Bilinguisme dans les Forces Armees Canadiennes, (Service Historique de la Defense Nationale, Tome 1 1763-1969,1987).

Pariseau Jean et Bernier Serge, Les Canadiens Francais et le Bilinguisme dans les Forces Armees Canadiennes, (Service Historique de la Defense Nationale, Tome 2 1769-1987,1987).

Regie du Royal 22e Regiment, Histoire du Royal 22e Regiment, (Quebec, Edition du Pellican, 1964).

Trevor N. Dupuy, Curt Johnson, and David L. Bonguard, Harper Encyclopedia of Military Biography, 1992.

CURRENT OFFICIAL POLICIES

The research part was completed with different studies conducted in 1994 and 1995 for the Director Land Personal Official Language. This information was acquired through DLP6 and provided valuable guidance in establishing the current officer position, data was also recovered from a recruiting center to have examined the national recruiting quotas.

Addy Colonel P.G., Institutional Bilingualism of the Regular Force-an Operational Necessity, (Kingston, National Defence College, 1984).

Allard Elizabeth, Notes de Synthese pour le SMA (pers) Enjeux et Sconva, 18 April 1994.

Allard Elizabeth, Prestation des Services de Base aux Familles des Militaires de Langue Minoritaire, Rapport du Sous-Comite du CELO, 19 November 1996.

Allard Elizabeth, Expose du MGen Boyle sur la Participation des Francophones dans les FC, June 1995.

Dionne Maj Normand, Recruiting statistics, CRFC Quebec, 27 April 2000.

Dionne Maj Normand, Recruiting statistics, CRFC Quebec, 3 May 2000.

The second chapter provided a quick overview of the official language policies and goals in Canadian Forces. The official publications A-AD-1022-101/AG-001 were

consulted in addition to official publication from DAOD, OAFB. These documents provided the basic information regarding the official policies.

A-AD-102-001/AG-001, Official Languages in DND and the CF, 1997-11-25.

OAFB 2-15, LANGUES OFFICIELLES, 30 January 1998, URL: http://131.134.220.99/admfincs/subjects/cfao/002-15_f.asp. Accessed 11 May 2000.

OAFB 9-21, ENSEIGNEMENT DES LANGUES, CONNAISSANCES LINGUISTIQUES ET ADMINISTRATION DE TESTS DANS LES FORCES CANADIENNES--LANGUES OFFICIELLES, URL: http://131.134.220.99/admfincs/subjects/cfao/009-21_f.asp. Accessed 11 May 2000.

OAFB 9-53, LANGUE D'INSTRUCTION, URL: http://131.134.220.99/admfincs/subjects/cfao/009-53_f.asp. Accessed 11 May 2000.

OAFB 9-61, LANGUES ETRANGERES-ENSEIGNEMENT, EXAMENS ET COMPETENCES, URL: http://131.134.220.99/admfincs/subjects/cfao/009-61_f.asp. Accessed 11 May 2000.

OAFB 11-14, PROGRAMME DE NOMINATIONS SPECIALES AU CADRE D'OFFICIERS, URL: http://131.134.220.99/admfincs/subjects/cfao/011-14_f.asp. Accessed 11 May 2000.

OAFB 11-16, REGLES REGISSANT LA REMISE DU BREVET ET LES PROMOTIONS-OFFICIERS-FORCE REGULIERE, URL: http://131.134.220.99/admfincs/subjects/cfao/011-06_f.asp. Accessed 11 May 2000.

DAOD 5038-1, Officer Professional Development (OPD) System, 26 November 1997, URL: http://131.134.220.99/admfincs/subjects/DAOD/5038/1_e.asp. Accessed 31 May 2000.

DAOD 5039-0, Officer Languages, 30 January 1998, URL: http://131.134.220.99/admfincs/subjects/DAOD/5039/0_e.asp. Accessed 31 May 2000.

DAOD 5039-4, Translation of Texts and Acquisition of Bilingual Documents, 30 January 1998, URL: http://131.134.220.99/admfincs/subjects/DAOD/5039/4_e.asp. Accessed 31 May 2000.

1211-1 (DGOL/DGLO), Official Languages Program/ Programme des Langues Officielles, 27 November 1987.